

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on May 7, 2007. Claims 1, 10, 11, and 25-29 were pending and were rejected. With this response, claims 1, 10, and 11 are amended. The remaining claims are unchanged and no new claims are added.

Acknowledgement of Information Disclosure Statement

As a preliminary matter, Applicant requests that the Examiner acknowledge that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statements filed December 31, 2003 and January 28, 2004 have been considered. Copies of the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statements and their return post cards are enclosed herein. Applicant requests consideration and entry of the cited references.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 10, 11, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh in view of Sumita in view of King or in view of Ellis, or in view of Ginter, or in view of Cameron. According to the Office Action, the previous combination of Bergh and Sumita “discloses multiple profiles/personas for a user (col 3, lines 25-47).” The references of King, Ellis, Ginter, or Cameron were cited as disclosing the amended features related to the profile fields and profile restriction. Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 10, and 11 so as to clarify the distinction between personas and profiles and to set forth their relationship to each other. Applicants also provide the term “user records” in lieu of the first recitation of “user profiles” to provide additional clarity. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as filed including on page 71, line 24 to page 73, line 17 and in figures 12 and 13. As claimed and as described in Figure 13 and on page 71, line 24 to page 73, line 17, among other places, the hierarchy of the records, personas, and profiles, may be depicted as: user → user record → user persona → user profile.

None of the references teach or make obvious the amended features of the claims relating to relationship of the records, personas, and profiles. In the Office Action, the personas and profiles are treated as interchangeable when described as “personas/profiles.” The newly cited references do not make clear this distinction either. Instead, the amended claim set forth that “a

database that stores a plurality of user records corresponding to a plurality of users, wherein each user record is associated with a plurality of user personas stored in the database and each user persona is associated with a plurality of user profiles, [and] wherein each user profile comprises a set of personal information data” which is not shown in the references or made obvious in the prior art. The records, personas, and profiles are not interchangeable but are separate features and levels of the claimed hierarchy.

Further, none of the references teach or make obvious the amended features of the claims relating to the relationship of the user records, personas, and profiles to each other. The amended claims set forth that “wherein each user record is associated with a plurality of user personas stored in the database.” These features are not shown in the references or made obvious in the prior art. The references simply do not teach the relationship or structure set forth in the independent claims where “each of the user profiles for each user record is grouped into the user personas, each being related to a unique, useful context such that at least one of the user profiles is grouped in at least two user personas.” The references do not recognize a hierarchical structure indicated in the claimed feature and thus also do not make this feature obvious. The references do not teach grouping a plurality of the profiles into designated personas by useful context.

Applicants respectfully request that the present amendment be entered, that the rejections be removed, and for favorable action and allowance of the application.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejections and for favorable action and allowance of the application. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (612) 607-7237.

Serial No. 09/196,338

In reply to Final Office Action mailed May 7, 2007

and Advisory Action mailed August 23, 2007

Page 11 of 11

Should any additional fees be necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit any such fees or overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1901 (Reference 60021-302901).

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Christopher R. Hilberg, Reg. No. 48,740
Customer No. 29,838

Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly, LLP

45 South Seventh St., Suite 3300

Minneapolis, MN 55402-1609

Telephone: 612-607-7340

Facsimile: 612-607-7100